### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 731

HE 004 095

**AUTHOR** 

Tisdel, Lin; And Others

TITLE

Measuring One University Output: A Survey of

Undergraduate Degree Holders from the University of

Georgia from the Classes of 1960-1970.

INSTITUTION

Georgia Univ., Athens. Office of Program Planning and

Analysis.

PUB DATE

[73]

NOTE

34p.

AVAILABLE FROM

Office of Program Planning and Analysis, White Avenue

Euilding, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

30602 (Free)

EDRS PRICE

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS

\*College Graduates; Curriculum Development; \*Educational Benefits; Educational Objectives; \*Higher Education; Program Evaluation; Program Planning; \*Social Mobility; \*Socioeconomic Status:

Student Attitudes: Student Opinion

IDENTIFIERS

\*University of Georgia

### ABSTRACT

This survey attempts to acquire feedback for University of Georgia graduates with regard to the impact of their college experiences on their careers and on their personal and social development. Information was obtained by means of a questionnaire. This feedback could be used by the various constituencies that make up the university in many different ways, some of which include: (1) an initial review of specific programs; (2) assistance in the establishment of objectives; and (3) assistance in the assessment of the effectiveness of curricula, facilities, and attitudes. (Author)

### MEASURING ONE UNIVERSITY OUTPUT:

### A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE HOLDERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FROM THE CLASSES OF 1960-1970

US OEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EOUCATION
THIS OOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
OUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED OO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EOUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Developed and written by:

Lin Tisdel

Data collected, conated

Lin Tisdel

and analyzed by:

Joseph Lechowicz

Dong Kon Kim

Approved by:

A. A. Sterns

Author:

Lin Tisdel

Title:

Measuring One University Output: A Survey of Undergraduate

Degree Holders From the University of Georgia From the

Classes of 1960-1970

Available From:

Office of Program Planning and Analysis

White Avenue Building

R^om 100

University of Georgia Athens, Georgia 30602

Date:

1972

Number of Pages:

32

### Abstract:

This survey attempts to acquire feedback from UGA graduates with respect to the impact of their college experiences on their careers and on their personal and social development. Information was obtained by means of a questionnaire to a sampling of UGA graduates. This feedback could be used by the various constituencies which make up the University in many different ways, some of which include: (1) a initial review of specific programs; (2) assistance in the establishment of objectives, and (3) assistance in the assessment of the effectiveness of curricula, facilities, attitudes, etc.

### MEASURING ONE UNIVERSITY OUTPUT:

A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE HOLDERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FROM THE CLASSES OF 1960-1970

Developed and written by:

Lin Tisdel

Data collected, conated

Lin Tisdel

and analyzed by:

Joseph Lechowicz

Dong Kon Kim

Approved by:

A. A. Sterns



### MEASURING ONE UNIVERSITY OUTPUT: A SURVEY OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE HOLDERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA FROM THE CLASSES OF 1960-1970

One feature of Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) which attracts many supporters is its *output orientation* (Farmer, 1970). Carpenter (1969) points out that such a system requires clearly expressed objectives which have appropriate measures of attainment. The most obvious output of higher education is the graduate: the much renowned but ill-defined *educated man*. One attainable measure of this output is the self-reported perceptions, opinions, and attitudes of the graduate about his college experience and its relation to his life after he leaves the campus.

Levin, et.al. (1971) in an excellent survey of the literature, offers abundant research evidence that education affects one's earnings, social and economic mobility, and other areas of opportunity. A comprehensive, longitudinal alumni survey had been conducted on the nationwide graduating class of 1961 by Spaeth and Greeley (1970). The total population consisted of 4,000 graduates of 135 accredited large colleges and universities. The results of this study were of great interest and value but the project team felt that a more individualized, up-to-date, tailor-made study of University of Georgia graduates was needed. Levin's review, along with recent publications from national and professional agenices including the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), clearly indicated that an alumni survey of UGA undergraduate degree holders was an item of importance for the Ford Foundation supported PPBS Project. Similar studies of graduate degree earners and Law School graduates have already been conducted for the University (Booth, 1970; Corry, 1971; Keith, 1972).

### **PURPOSE**

Since the educated man has been developed not only as an "economic being" but also as a "human being", the main purpose of this survey was to gather feedback from University of Georgia graduates with respect to the impact of their college experiences on their careers and on their personal and social development. This feedback could be used by the various constituencies which make up the University in many different ways, some of which include:

- 1. A critical review of specific programs;
- 2. supportive evidence for new or increased services;



- 3. assistance in the establishment of objectives;
- 4. assistance in the assessment of the effectiveness of curricula, facilities, attitudes, etc.

The results of this first survey should be considered as those of a pilot study because of the ever-present constraints of limited time and resources. Subsequent studies, however, can use these first efforts as a foundation.

### **METHOD**

### **SUBJECTS**

The subjects for this study were 821 undergraduate degree holders from the classes of 1960 through 1970. Every twenty-fifth person was selected from an alphabetized listing of all University of Georgia baccalaureates for those years. The Alumni Office was most helpful in providing this list and addressing the envelopes for the first mailing.

### THE INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire was developed over several months with the assistance of many people\* both on and off campus who provided inputs in the form of suggestions and constructive criticisms. Some of the items were taken from Booth's (1964) and other alumni surveys and modified for use with an undergraduate population. Most items, however, came about as a result of the questions the project team felt were relevant and necessary for our purposes. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: Job related questions and non-job related questions. A "pilot" study was conducted using the instrument with approximately ten on-campus personnel who were graduates of the University. The author recognizes that such a "field trial" might be considered inadequate and, hence, the previous statement that this entire effort might best be considered a pilot study.

### **PROCEDURE**

Questionnaires (See Appendix A) were mailed out by third class mail to graduates selected by the sampling procedure (excluding 1971, foreign residents and other not readily accessible graduates. Six weeks after the initial mailing the first follow-up was conducted: a post card was mailed to each non-respondent requesting that he return his questionnaire. The six week period was



<sup>\*(</sup>Dr. Warren A. Findley, Dr. Robert Stoltz, Dr. David Suddick, Dr. Gary C. Stock, and Mr. Larry McDaniel, and various student leaders)

used because of the slowness — up to six weeks — of bulk rate mail. Four weeks after the post card follow-up, a follow-up letter (See Appendix C) was sent out along with another copy of the questionnaire. All instruments were returned by means of a business reply flap that was part of the questionnaire. The cut-off date for responses to be included in the study was six weeks after the second follow-up.

### **RESULTS**

Four hundred and seventy of the 821 (57.24%) questionnaires were returned by March 8, 1972. Additional returns have come in since this date and may be included in future reports. Table I presents the distribution of the respondees by the degree which they earned at the University. The Bachelor of Business Administration was the degree most frequently appearing with 26 percent of those responding. The next most frequent single degree was the Bachelor of Science of Education representing seventeen percent of degrees held by respondees, Bachelor of Science representing fourteen percent, and the Bachelor of Arts representing thirteen percent. All other degrees were under six percent.

Tables 2 and 3 show the distribution of students by academic year entered and graduated respectively. The fact that the University has students who enter, leave without graduating and later reenter helps account for the number shown entering before the latest "expected" date of the decade selected for sampling (graduates from 1960-1970). In addition, those students shown entering past the latest expected date (1966-1967) for freshmen entrants to complete their baccalaureate degree reflect the presence of transfer students at the University.

Table 4, the Distribution of Respondees by section of the country, shows that sixty-four percent of those responding have remained in the state of Georgia. While this data shows that those University of Georgia graduates responding to the questionnaire live and work in most sections of the United States, it is interesting to note that an overwhelming majority of eighty-eight percent have remained in the south and its neighboring states. Such retention is desirable for a public institution in that it serves the state and region that supports it.

A general picture of the University of Georgia graduates' perceptions of the University and its impact on their lives is derived from the statistics of the question-by-question detailed breakdown of responses presented in Table 5.

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDEES BY DEGREE EARNED

TABLE 1

Percent 13 6 26 2 11 14 17 5	100 TABLE 3	3 5 6 8 11 12 13
•.	Number	13 25 21 30 33 49 49 57 7 463 7 470
Number 60 29 115 11 3 61 35 76 19 19	6 6 4 4 4 4 ated	1960 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1969 1970
-	DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDEES  Y  Percent Gradu	2 6 8 11 100
	DIST	88 + 88 + 88 + 88 + 88 + 88 + 88 + 88
AB ABJ BBA BBA BFA BSA BSA BSFR BSPH DVM	SUBTOTAL No response TOTAL TABLE 2 Year Entered	1956 - 57 and before 1957 - 58 1958 - 59 1958 - 59 1959 - 60 1960 - 61 1962 - 63 1962 - 63 1962 - 65 1965 - 66 1965 - 66 1966 - 68 and after SUBTOTAL No response TOTAL

TABLE 4

## DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDEES BY SECTION OF THE COUNTRY\*

	Number	Percent
State of Georgia	262	25
South Atlantic	62	19
South Central	19	വ
Middle Atlantic	20	വ
New England	9	-
North Central	01	2
Pacific	8	2
Territories and APO	80	2
SUBTOTAL	412	100
No response	28	
TOTAL	470	

\* South Atlantic - Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, D. C., Maryland and Delaware;

South Central - Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas;

Middle Atlantic - New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania;

New England - Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire and Rhode Island;

North Central - Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

Pacific - Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Haw aii;

Territories and Possessions - Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and A.P.Ö.

### **EMPLOYMENT**

About seventy-six percent (368 of 470) of those responding reported that they are working full time while eleven percent reported that they were working on a graduate or professional degree. Six percent were in the military and only two percent said they were unemployed. Thirty-seven percent of those who reported that they are working noted some aspect of business as their occupation. Twenty-two percent indicated that they are teaching for a living while four percent are in the fields of medicine and law. Forty-six percent of those responding have been with their present employer and sixty percent have been in their current position for less then two years. This may be an indication of the recent increase in the number of college graduates as well as their economic mobility. Only five percent reported having been with the same employer for 10 or more years with only two percent having held the same position for that period of time.

### **COLLEGE DEGREE**

The Benefits of a college degree seemed important to the graduates since ninety-seven percent indicated that they would still go to college as preparation for life. Only sixty-six percent, however, indicated that they would enroll in the same degree program. Those reporting that they would change programs indicated Business related programs most frequently with twenty-nine percent, the professions (Law and Health) next with twenty percent, specialization within current job with twelve percent, with additional areas all under ten percent.

### **COLLEGE TO JOB**

Forty-eight percent of the respondees indicated that their undergraduate curriculum was related to a very great extent or to a great extent to their current employment, twenty-nine percent reported that their curriculum was somewhat related to their current employment while twenty-one percent indicated that their current employment was not related to any great degree to their undergraduate curriculum. In response to a question about which courses contributed most to a graduate's career, the responses were categorized as within the area studied (about seventy-five percent), outside the area studied, (twelve percent), and other courses (about thirteen percent). Another question dealt with the courses contributing least to a graduate's career.



The universe of responses with regard to the impact of curriculum becomes somewhat obscured in question 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, and 22 of Table 5 where open ended responses were required. For example, eleven percent — as a first choice — felt foreign languages contributed *least* to their career, while, (as is more elaborated on later related to question 20) ten percent — as a first choice expressed that foreign languages contributed most to their pesonal and social development. To judge the importance of these type of statistics the second choice should also be examined in each case. As to further what was considered a contributing least, Chemistry and English followed with eight and seven percent respectively. The respondees recommended that anyone entering in their profession take job-related courses (twenty-six percent), business courses (twenty-one percent), and Accounting and Psychology (nine percent each).

### **UGA RATING**

The alumni were asked to rate various aspects of the University of Georgia while they were in attendance in their degree programs. Eighty percent or more of the respondees rated the following aspects as favorable (average or above average): the faculty, the administration, the physical facilities, the public image, student housing, the library, and cultural activities.

The library facilities received the highest ratings — seventy percent believed the library to be above average. Two aspects received unfavorable ratings: fifty percent of the alumni thought that academic and vocational counseling was below average. In addition fifty-four percent rated personal counseling below average.

The alumni were asked to rate various aspects of their undergraduate curriculum while they were in attendance. The overall responses were favorable although about a quarter of the respondees felt that they were not satisfied with the availability of the faculty, the interest of their fellow students, and the relevance of the curriculum as preparation for their current jobs.

Over one-half of the respondees reported aquiring their first position upon graduation through their own solicitation. A number of other means were mentioned although none received over ten percent. Seven percent of the graduates mentioned the Placement Office as being the primary means of obtaining their first job. It must be noted that the questionnaire did not ask how many students availed themselves of the Placement Office.



### SALARY

The median starting salary of those responding fell in the \$6000 to \$8000 range while respondents reported *current* salaries which range from less than \$5,000 to over \$19,000 with a median salary between \$7,000 and \$10,000.

### SOCIAL AND PERSUNAL

Eighty nine percent of those responding telt that their undergraduate program was outstanding or adequate in contributing to their personal and social development. Extracurricular activities seem to play a role in personal and social development with athletic events, off campus living experiences, and informal bull sessions playing the key roles. A substantial number of students did not believe that lectures by eminent authorities or fraternity and scrority life contributed to any degree to their personal or social development.

Those respondees answering the question related the courses contributing most to their personal and social development listed most frequently psychology (sixteen percent), Speech (fifteen percent) and Foreign languages (ten percent). All other responses were less than ten percent. The list of responses for the courses contributing least to personal and social development included mathematics (thirteen percent), Chemistry (nine percent), English (eight percent), and Foreign Languages (six percent). All other responses were not more than two percent.

As indicated earlier, it is interesting to note that foreign languages was given as having contributed both to *most* (ten percent) and to *least* (six percent). It is also noteworthy that psychology was listed as a course contributing most to both career and personal and social development and was also recommended as a course to be taken for career development as well as personal and social development. Speech was listed for *both* career and personal development also and appeared as a course contributing most to personal and social development. Accounting was also listed three times: It was recommended both for people entering professions and for anyone attending college. Additionally accounting was listed as one of the courses greatly contributing to a graduate's career.

7

### 1. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT OCCUPATION?

		Number
ė.	a. Working full-time	368
Ď.	b. Working part-time	28
ပ	c. Working on an undergraduate degree	2
Ġ.	d. In the Military Service	29
ai	e. Unemployed	10
f.	f. Working on a graduate or professional degree	20
9	g. Housewife	35
h.	h. Other	.22

\*Does not add to 470 because of multiple responses. A definitive breakdown of multiple responses will not be made in this report. TOTAL

# 2. IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED EITHER FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME, WHAT IS YOUR TITLE OR POSITION?

		Number	Percent
	Teaching (Elementary, Secondary and College)	5:3	22
	Business (Administration, Management, Accounting)	111	26
	Business (Sales and Real Estate)	46	11
	Professions (Doctors, Veterinarians, Lawyers)	16	4
	Government and Public Service (Local, State and Federal)	32	7
	Graduate School	13	ო
	Military Service	28	9
	Housewives	ო	-
	Others (less th. 3 listed)	89	21
SUBTOTAL		453	100
	No response	37	
TOTAL		470	

· **\_9**\_

and the second of the second o

TABLE 5 (con't)

3a. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN WITH THIS FIRM, GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY, SCHOOL SYSTEM OR COLLEGE?

	Number	Percent *
less than 2	191	46
2-3	79	19
4-5	69	17
2-9	37	O
8 – 8	19	വ
10 or more	20	5
SUBTOTAL	415	00
No response	.55	
TOTAL	470	

\*Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

3b. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU HELD YOUR CURRENT POSITION?

	Number	Percent
Less than 2	246	09
2-3	98	21
4 – 5	42	10
2 – 9	25	9
8 – 9	9	-
10 or more	8	2
SUBTOTAL		100
No response	57	
TOTAL	470	

- I service addite adults to the service the

TABLE 5 (con't)

4. 2	HAT I	<u>&gt;</u>	OUR	ANNUAL	4. WHAT IS YOUR ANNUAL SALARY RANGE?	RANGE?		
							Number	Percent
7	Less than \$5,00	\$5,0	900				42	10
63	\$5,000 - \$6,99	\$6,	666				55	13
<b>6</b> 3	666'6\$ - 000'2\$	88	666				123	29
63	\$10,000 - \$12,999	- \$1	2,999				101	24
63	\$13,000 - \$15,939	- \$1	5,939				61	14
63	\$16,000 - \$18,999	- \$1	8,999				21	ស
0	Over \$19,000	000					23	ល
SUB.	SUBTOTAL						426	100
<	No response	nse					44	
TOTAL	٩L						470	

STILL		•
YOU		Donog
MOULD		
T YOU KNOW NOW OF THE DEMANDS OF LIFE AFTER COLLEGE, WOULD YOU STILL		
AFTER		Alternation of the second
LIFE		•
P	R?	
<b>EMANDS</b>	SE AS PREPARATION FOR YOUR CAREER?	
<u> </u>	₹0 1	
Ŧ	OR O	
9	L Z	
NON	ATIO	
KNOW	PREPAR/	
YOU	AS	
WHAT	OLLEGE	
SNIMON	GO TO COLLEGE	
X	ß	
r.		

Yes . No SUBTOTAL		`	Number 444 12 456	Percent 97 3
No response			470	,

to the residence of the said o

TABLE 5 (con't)

6. IF YOU STILL WOULD GO TO COLLEGE, WOULD YOU ENROLL IN THE SAME DEGREE PROGRAM?

Percent	99	34	100		
Number	300	154	454	16	470
	Yes	No	SUBTOTAL	No response	TOTAL

## 6. (con't) IF NOT, WHAT PROGRAM OR TRAINING WOULD YOU PURSUE?

	Number	Percent
Accounting	14	6
Business	33	20
Education	13	ω
Health Professions (Doctor, Dentist, Veterinarian, Pharmacist)	26	16
Гам	7	4
Liberal Arts	8	Ŋ
Specialization within current job	19	12
Others (less than 5 listed)	34	26
TOTAL	154	100

TABLE 5 (con't)

# 7. DO THE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES OR MAJOR YOU PURSUED RELATE TO YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT?

	Number	Percent
To a very great extent	107	24
To a great extent	108	24
Somewhat	131	29
Hardly at all	6	2
No	93	21
SUBTOTAL	448	100
No response	22	
TOTAL	470	

# 8. WHICH COLLEGE COURSES, IF ANY, HAVE MADE THE GREATEST CONTRIBUTION TO YOUR CAREER? (two choices)

	Number	Percent
WITHIN AREA STUDIED	1st/2nd	1st/2nd
Needed for Current job	232/185	99/89
Because of Professor	12/ 6	4/3
Because of Course	10/ 12	3/ 4
OUTSIDE AREA STUDIED		
Needed for Current job	34/32	10/12
Because of Professor	3/3	1/1
Because of course	3/ 10	1/ 3
Student Teaching	20/ 5	6/ 2
Psychdlogy (includes Educational Psychology)	14/5	4/2
Accounting	14/ 14	4/ 6
SUBTOTAL	354/272	100/100
No Response	116/198	
TOTAL	470/470	

TABLE 5 (con't)

9. WHICH COLLEGE COURSES, IF ANY, CONTRIBUTED LEAST TO YOUR CAREER? (two choices)

	Number	Percent
	1st/2nd	1st/2nd
Not studies related	1/6	0/ 4
Foreign language	33/ 4	11/ 3
Chemistry	25/ 8	9/8
English (includes literature)	21/2	1/1
Georgia History	11/ 3	4/2
U.S. History	က	-
Other (less than 3 listed)	203/120	68 /84
SUBTOTAL	297/143	100/100
No response	173/327	
TOTAL	470/470	

### 10. WHAT COURSES DID YOU NOT TAKE BUT WOULD RECOMMEND TO ANYONE ENTERING YOUR PROFESSION? (two choices)

		Number	rercent
Š	Speech	11	4
Ř	Accounting	27/8	9/ 4
B	Business	66/31	21/16
Ps	Psychology	27/12	9 /6
ช	Computer Programming	12/ 5	4/3
ol	Job related	80/57	26/30
M	Mathematics and Logic	19/8	6/4
Ö	Other(less than 4 listed)	11/11	23/37
SUBTOTAL		313/192	100/100
Ň	No response	157/278	
TOTAL		470/470	

TABLE 5 con't

11. RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA WHILE YOU WERE IN ATTENDANCE

TABLE 5 con't

Percent		36	53	12	101				26	09	15	101				70	26	4	100		
Number		163	240	53	456	14	470		115	266	65	446	24	470		325	123	17	465	വ	470
	d. The public image	Above sverage	Average	Below average	SUBTOTAL	No response	TOTAL	e. Student housing	Above average	Average	Below average	SUBTOTAL	No respo:1se	TOTAL	f. The library	Above average	Average	Below average	SUBTOTAL	No response	TOTAL

വ TABLE con't

TABLE 5

con't

12. INDICATE YOUR REACTIONS TO THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF YOUR UNDERGRADUATE STUDY WHILE YOU WERE

AT THE UNIV AFT THE UNIV Very satisfied Satisfied Not satisfied Very satisfied Satisfied Not satisfied Subtrotal No response TOTAL TOTAL Very satisfied Subtrotal The depth of The depth of The satisfied Satisfied Satisfied No response TOTAL No response Total	AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA.	Number	a. The way courses were presented	Very satisfied 59 13	313 68	<i>t</i>	461	C	470	b. The variety of subjects covered	Very satisfied 103 22	286 62	71	460	01	470	c. The depth of coverage	Very satisfied 59		84	458	
---	-------------------------------	--------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	--------	----------	-----	---	-----	------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------	----	-----	----	-----	--------------------------	-------------------	--	----	-----	--

TABLE 5

d. The level of course difficulty  Very satisfied Satisfied No response TOTAL  TOTAL  To The number of credit hours required Very satisfied Substorme  Not satisfied No response  TOTAL  To The number of credit hours required  Very satisfied Substorme  To The teaching ability of the faculty  Very satisfied Satisfied Substorme  To The teaching ability of the faculty  Very satisfied Substorme  Substorme  To The teaching ability of the faculty  Very satisfied Satisfied Satisfied Not satisfied Satisfied Nor satisfied Satisfied Nor satisfied Satisfied Nor satisfied Nor satisfied Satisfied Nor satisfied N
jred ~

TABLE 5 con't

	ber Percent	19 53 28		64 25	ច		
The availability oo Very satisfied Satisfied Not satisfied SUBTOTAL No response TOTAL The interest of th Very satisfied Satisfied Not satisfied No response TOTAL TOTAL No response TOTAL TOTAL No response TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL TOTAL Nor satisfied Nor satisfied Nor satisfied Nor satisfied Nor satisfied TOTAL TOTAL	g. The availability of the faculty		f the student	Pe	on of your current job	ied	

TABLE 5

## 13. HOW DID YOU GET YOUR FIRST POSITION AFTER COMPLETING YOUR DEGREE? THROUGH:

	Number	Percent
University Professor	15	က
Own solicitation	237	53
University of Georgia Placement Office	30	7
Family	24	ഹ
Friend	42	6
Advertisement	∞	2
Return to former position	18	4
Other (less than 4 listed)	73	16
SUBTOTAL	447	66
No response	23	
TOTAL	470	

# 14. INDICATE THE NUMBER OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS YOU HAVE HAD SINCE RECEIVING YOUR DEGREE.

Percent	9	44	27	15	9	8	•	100		
Aumper	28	201	122	67	27	7	ო	455	15	470
	•									
	0	•	8	m	4	c)	9	SUBTOTAL	No response	TOTAL

TABLE 5

con't

15. IF YOU HAVE HELD MORE THAN ONE POSITION, WHY DID YOU LEAVE THE PREVIOUS POSITION (S)?

		Mc - chellenging opportunity	N. well suited to former job	Pe conslity conflict	O .or (less than 5 listed)		
lumber	73	35	10	ıs	92	.15	255 470
Percent	34	16	S	2	43	100	

16. I YOU HAVE HELD MORE THAN ONE POSITION, HOW MANY HAVE BEEN RELATED TO YOUR UNDERGRADUA'S COURSE WORK OR MAJOR?

Percent	24	23	34	13	9	0	00		
Number	99	<b>2</b> 5	80	31	14	1	236	234	470
,									
,								9.	
,	Ų		.:	٠,	•	••	SUB. OTAL	asuodsau (+ )	TOT L

TABLE 5

con't

# 17. WHAT WAS THE ANNUAL SALARY RANGE OF YOUR FIRST POSITION AFTER GETTING YOUR DEGREE?

	Number	Percent
Less than \$4,000	40	10
\$4,000 - \$5,999	138	35
\$6,000 - \$7,999	140	36
\$8,000 - \$9,999	52	13
More than \$10,000	20	5
SUBTOTAL	390	66
No response	80	
TOTAL	470	

## HOW EFFECTIVE WERE YOUR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN CONTRIBUTING TO YOUR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT? <del>1</del>8.

	Number	Percent
Outstanding	29	15
Adequate	335	74
Inadequate	52	1
SUBTOTAL	454	100
No response	16	
TOTAL	470	

TABLE 5

19. TO WHAT EXTENT, IF ANY, DID THE FOLLOWING EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTE TO YOUR

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT?		
a. Cultural affairs (concerts, plays, etc.)	Number	Percent
A great deal	88	20
Somewhat	250	56
Not at all	106	24
SUBTOTAL	444	100
No response	26	
TOTAL	470	
b. Athletic events (Football haskerball etc.)	Number	Percent
A great deal	9	;
	061	44
Somewhat	184	41
Not at all	29	15
SUBTOTAL	447	100
No response	23	
TOTAL	470	')

The second of th

TABLE 5 (con't)

authorities)
(Eminent
lectures
talks or
Topical
ပ

A great deal		
Somewhat		
Not at all	147 34	
SUBTOTAL		
No response	39	
TOTAL	470	
c. Fraternity of soronty life		
A great deal		
Somewhat	87 21	
Not at all		
SUBTOTAL		
No response	48	
TOTAL	470	
e. Dormitory life		
A great deal		
Somewhat	164 38	
Not at al/		
SUBTOTAL		
No response	42	
TOTAL	470	

TABLE 5

	Number	Percent
f. Off campus living experience		
A great deal	181	44
Somewhat	124	30
Notatall	104	25
SUBTOTAL	409	66
No response	61	
TOTAL	470	
g. Informal "Bull" sessions		
A great deal	192	44
Somewhat	213	49
Not at all	29	7
SUBTOTAL	434	100
No response	36	
TOTAL	470	
h. Others		
A great deal	39	67
Somewhat	13	22
Not at all	CO	10
SUBTOTAL	58	66
No response	412	
TOTAL	470	

TABLE 5 (con't)

20. WHICH, IF ANY, OF YOUR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES CONTRIBIT

AND SO	WHICH, IT ANY, OF YOUR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES CONTRIBUTED THE MOST TO YOUR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT? (two choices)	E MOST TO YOUR	R PERSONAL
		Number	Percent
		1st/2nd	1st/2nd
	Speech	34, 6	15/ 4
	Psychology	36/ 9	16/ 7
	Philosophy	4/ 3	2/ 2
	Music and/or Art	18/ 8	8/ 2
;	Family Relations	7/:1	3/ 1
•	History	7/ 5	3, 3
	Foreign Languages	24/10	10/ 7
	Because of Professor	4/ 2	2/ 1
	Other (less than 4 listed)	98/105	42/70
SUBTOTAL		232/149	100/100
	No response	238/321	
TOTAL		470/470	



TABLE 5 (con't)

21. WHICH, IF ANY, OF YOUR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES CONTRIBUTED THE LEAST TO YOUR PERSONAL AND

SOCIAL	SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT? (two choices)		
		Number 1st/2nd	Percent 1st/2nd
	Foreign Languages	11/5	8 /9
	Chemistry	16/3	9/ 5
•	English (includes Literature)	14/3	8/ 2
	Mathematics	22/ 2	13/ 3
	Biology	4/ 1	2/ 2
	Geography	4/ 1	2/ 2
	R.O.T.C.	4	2
	Bad Professor or Course	4/3	2/ 5
	Other (less than 4 listed)	94/47	EA/72
SUBTOTAL		173/65	100/100
	No response	297/405	
IOIAL		470/470	

TABLE 5 (con't)

22. AMONG THE NON-JOB-RELATED COURSES YOU DID NOT TAKE, WHICH WOULD YOU RECOMMEND TO ANYONE ATTENDING COLLEGE? (two choices)

	Number 1st/2nd	Percent 1st/2nd	
Speech	1 /6	4/ 1	
Psychology	24/ 3	11/ 3	
Music and/or Art	38/ 7	7 /11	
Accounting	1 // 1	3/ 1	
Family Relations	1 / 21	8/ 1	
Business	27/14	12/13	
Religion	4/ 3	2/ 3	
History	9/ 4	4/4	
Other (less than 4 listed)	88/73	39/68	
SUBTOTAL	223/107	100/100	
No response	247/333		
TOTAL	470/470		

TABLE 5 (con't)

(two choices)
TOPICS:
IS OR RELATE
URTHER COMMENTS ON ANY OF THE QUESTIONS OR
23.

		Number	Percent
	Pro-University of Georgia	1st/2nd 33/ 5	1st/2nd 17/ 9
	Con-University of Georgia	22/ 6	12/11
	Pro-questionnaire	2	-
	Co 小のいまtionnaire	10/ 1	5/2
	Pro-Protessor	ო	2
	Con-Professor	14/6	7/11
	Con-Counseling	19/ 4	10/ 7
	Others (less than 3 listed)	89/33	46/60
SUBTOTAL		192/55	100/100
	No response	278/415	
TOTAL		470/470	

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The results of the study indicate that the graduates of the University of Georgia are well satisfied with the institution from which they graduated.

As a basis for program-analysis within an integrated system of Planning, Programming and Budgeting the results of this study — and the necessary follow-up studies — are an important input in evaluating existing degree programs and its curricula; last, but not least, a new look on student services is indicated.

This particular study has indicated the need for:

- a) A critical evaluation of the counseling process including the following areas:
  - 1) personal
  - 2) vocational
  - 3) academic
- b) An evaluation of the courses students take, both required and elective.

It should be stressed that this study involved only those alumni who have received a Baccalaureate degree. Future studies — it is recommended — should encompass a broader universe of University of Georgia outputs.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- BOOTH, EDWARD M. A Follow Up Study of Alumni Who Completed Doctoral Degrees in the College of Education at the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1970, pp. 101 (unpublished dissertation).
- CARPENTER, M. B. "Program Budgeting as all ay to Focus on Objectives in Education." Santa Monica, California, Rand Corporation, September, 1969, pp. 4162.
- CORRY, JOHN, "Placement of Study of 1968-1969 Law School Graduates.", Athens, Georgia, 1970, pp.10 (unpublished paper).
- FARMER, JAMES, Why Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems for Higher Education.

  Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.
- KEITH, NATHAN READ, "A Follow-Up Study of the Doctor of Philosophy Graduates of the University of Georgia 1966-1970," Athens, Georgia. 1972, pp.93 (unpublished dissertation).
- LAWRENCE, BEN, et. al. (ED.); The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification,

  Measurement, and Evaluation; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education,

  370. pp. 130.
- LEVIN, HENRY M. et. al.; "School Achievement and Post-School Success: A Review," Review of Educational Research. Vol. 41, No. 1, February 1971. pp. 1-16.
- SPAETH, JOE L. and ANDREW M. GREELEY, Recent Alumni and Higher Education. (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company) 1970, pp. 199.

